UNCLASSIFIED
(Classification)

395 RF

COPIES TO:
S/S-S:DIR
TMB
NEA
RF:WEB

S/S # 8124246

Date SEP 2[illegible] 1981

DEPARTMENT OF STATE
EXECUTIVE SECRETARIAT
TRANSMITTAL FORM

FOR: Mr. Richard V. Allen
National Security Council
The White House

REFERENCE:

TO: President Reagan **FROM:** Louis H. Golden

DATE: July 29, 1981 **SUBJECT:** Israel's Attack on the Iraqi Nuclear Reactor

WHITE HOUSE REFERRAL DATED: August 11, 1981 **NSC #** _____ (if any)

____ THE ATTACHED ITEM WAS SENT DIRECTLY TO THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

ACTION TAKEN:

X A draft reply is attached.

____ A draft reply will be forwarded.

____ A translation is attached.

____ An information copy of a direct reply is attached.

____ We believe no response is necessary for the reason cited below.

____ Other.

REMARKS:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE A/CDC/MR
REVIEWED BY WDB DATE 1/8/84
RDS☐or XDS☐EXT. DATE _____
TS AUTH. _____ REASON(S) _____
ENDORSE EXISTING MARKINGS ☐
DI CLASSIFIED☒ RELEASABLE☒
RELEASE DENIED☐
PA or FOI EXEMPTIONS _____

'81 SEP 28 P8:02

Nancy M. Bikoumbin for
L. Paul Bremer, III
Executive Secretary

Drafted:NEA/IAI:ECubbison:def
9/25/81:X23672 #8124246
Cleared:NEA/IAI:CHill
NEA:MDraper

DRAFT REPLY

Dear Mr. Golden:

I am writing in response to your letter of July 29, addressed to the attention of the President, regarding your correspondence with the Department about the recent fighting along the Israel-Lebanon border and the suspension of delivery of U.S. military aircraft to Israel.

As you know, the President lifted the suspension on August 17, following an extensive review of the causes and implications of recent military actions in the Middle East. We were deeply disturbed by the escalation of violence along the Israel-Lebanon border during July, which resulted in heavy civilian casualties in Lebanon as well as civilian deaths and injuries in Israel. In the general atmosphere of increased violence and tension in the region at the time, the President decided it would be inappropriate to resume the deliveries of military aircraft to Israel that had originally been suspended in the wake of Israel's June 7 attack on the Iraqi nuclear facility.

In lifting the suspension, the Administration took account of positive developments in the situation, particularly the events in Lebanon leading to a ceasefire there on July 24. We are working to strengthen the ceasefire in the hope that we can begin to address the longer-term situation in Lebanon. This in turn will

Mr. Louis H. Golden,
Commodity Steel and Processing, Inc.,
8701 E. Eight Mile Road,
Warren, Michigan 48089.

facilitate other steps toward peace in the Middle East.

We recognize Israel's unique security situation and the right of states to defend themselves against attack. At the same time, we have consistently worked to urge restraint by all parties to the Arab-Israeli conflict, and to reduce the level of violence in the Middle East.

The long-standing U.S. commitment to Israel's security and well-being is fully shared by this Administration. During his recent meetings with Prime Minister Begin in Washington, President Reagan emphasized the permanence of U.S. support for Israel's security, and our willingness to work closely with Israel on cooperative measures to improve the security of the region as a whole from external threats. We will also continue our partnership with Israel and Egypt in the peace process, seeking to make progress towards a just and durable Middle East peace. In that effort and in all our Middle East policies, one of our primary goals will remain to ensure Israel's security on a permanent basis.

Sincerely,

Anne Higgins

Department of State

.8124246

THE WHITE HOUSE OFFICE

REFERRAL

AUGUST 11, 1981

TO: DEPARTMENT OF STATE

ACTION REQUESTED:
DRAFT REPLY FOR SIGNATURE OF ANNE HIGGINS

DESCRIPTION OF INCOMING:

ID: 035708

MEDIA: LETTER, DATED JULY 29, 1981

TO: PRESIDENT REAGAN

FROM: MR. LOUIS H. GOLDEN
COMMODITY STEEL AND PROCESSING,
INC.
8701 EAST EIGHT MILE ROAD
WARREN MI 48089

SUBJECT: ISRAEL'S ATTACK ON THE IRAQI NUCLEAR REACTOR;
SUPPORTER OF ISRAEL - DOES NOT AGREE WITH
LEGISLATIVE ATTITUDE ENCOURAGED BY DOS

PROMPT ACTION IS ESSENTIAL -- IF REQUIRED ACTION HAS NOT BEEN TAKEN WITHIN 9 WORKING DAYS OF RECEIPT, PLEASE TELEPHONE THE UNDERSIGNED AT 456-7486.

RETURN BASIC CORRESPONDENCE, CONTROL SHEET AND COPY OF RESPONSE (OR DRAFT) TO:
AGENCY LIAISON, ROOM 33, THE WHITE HOUSE

BY DIRECTION OF THE PRESIDENT:
LESLIE SORG
DIRECTOR OF AGENCY LIAISON
PRESIDENTIAL CORRESPONDENCE

commodity steel & processing, inc.

Offices and Warehouse
8701 E. Eight Mile Road
Warren (Detroit), Mich. 48089
Telephone: (313) 758-1040
Telex: 234331

.8124245

July 29, 1981

035708

Secretary to President Reagan
THE WHITE HOUSE
Washington, D.C. 20500

Dear Miss Secretary:

Enclosed please find copies of my correspondence to Dean E. Fischer, who is the Department Spokesman for the Department of State.

The reason I am taking the liberty to write you is that I am hoping the President may receive my thoughts on this matter.

I know the President is a very busy man and his time is limited and I will understand if he does not read my letter. All I can do is hope.

Very sincerely,

Louis H. Golden

LHG/amb

Enclosure

commodity steel & processing, inc.

Offices and Warehouse
8701 E. Eight Mile Road
Warren (Detroit), Mich. 48089
Telephone: (313) 756-1600
Telex 23-6331

July 29, 1981

Mr. Dean E. Fischer
Assistant Secretary-Designate for
Public Affairs and Department Spokesman
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF STATE
Washington, D.C. 20520

Dear Mr. Fischer:

I have your kind letter of July 17, 1981, concerning my letter to President Reagan. I very much appreciate your taking the time to write me.

I know that I cannot hope to change the mind of our State Department and the opinions of some of the members of the present administration, who I have supported and admire; however, the legalistic attitude encouraged by our State Department falls short of reality.

More and more people are expressing concern with regard to what is called "one-sided views from the other side of the mountain". I have never understood the advantage of war; I do recognize the advantage of peace. Taking into account all deliberations, I know that we have clout with the Israelis, but must we insist that they absorb attack and bombardment and not respond? Eventually, they must hit back. The question, therefore, is "How does a country wage peace when its enemies, who completely surround it, wage constant war?" Outside of Sadat, who else is there to talk with?

I think the human instinct for survival recognizes a response if someone is shooting at you. In view of all the hullabaloo, my next question is, "How do you shoot back gently so you don't hurt anybody?"

I think everyone prefers peace, however, it will take more than genius and perseverance, and certainly normal diplomacy. It will take a generation of education to eliminate the wrongs of hatred created from generations of acid rhetoric against the western unbelievers and infidels, as illustrated by Khomeini, by Colonel Qaddafi, by Saddam Hussain, by Yasar Arafat and many others. Such hatred poured into the minds of people living in abject poverty and ignorance causes extreme reactions. We have seen what happened to sanity in Iran and other Arab countries. In Iran, Jews are executed simply because they have pictures of Israel in their homes.

In school we were taught, "the best defense is a good offense". Apparently this is also true in war. Again, I raise another question, "Why does this prerogative belong to everyone but the Israelis?" Why are there no howls of indignation when the arabs invade each others' countries, when they shoot each others' civilians? When they maintain a war of genocide against the Lebanese Christians? Why is there nothing said about the 4500 Jews being held hostage in Syria? What about the Syrians' shelling the Christian cities in Lebanon and the tremendous death toll - no U.N. resolutions, no outcries, no threats - just quiet acceptance, including Russian support - no refusal of arms. Therefore, I ask again, "What is this terrible deed the Israelis committed in defending themselves?" Is war just a one-sided experience?

When the Arabs use up war implements and munitions, the Russians re-supply them quickly. They even hold joint maneuvers with them. When the Israelis begin to protect themselves, they are hounded, attacked in the media and restraints are imposed on them. Why is it that only the Israelis are punished and condemned?

We understand that Russia is the real culprit. They export not only machines of war, but terrorism as well. This works obviously to Russia's advantage. But I ask a simple question, "What happens if Russia decides to inspire revolt within Iran and perhaps Saudi Arabia? Or decides to invade outright? Do we take them on alone? How do we defend our interests -- whatever they may be? What allies do we have in that area that we can depend on? Anwar Sadat - how capable is his army?

The Israelis can put 700,000 men in the field within 72 hours. I think they are damned good allies, and we should recognize them as such. Granted, not everything they do pleases us; certainly it doesn't please the Saudis, but I believe we can depend on them, and I think we should show them we care about them and not harass them, either in our newspapers, or radio or T.V., exploiting just one-sided explanations.

They know that the United States is a close and dear friend. They know that without American help they would not survive. They know that America has interests in the Middle East, which are different than their own, but the prime specific difference is that the very existence of their country is dependent on their own instincts and abilities for self-preservation.

If we were analyzing the combatants, we would have to consider that there are 21 hostile countries with over one hundred million Arabs, who have a combined income of over two hundred billion dollars per year. The Israelis are a nation with about three and one-half million people with a total income of perhaps six billion dollars per year.

With this obvious fact, how can you blame the Israelis for shooting from the hip. There comes a time when necessity turns defense into an act of survival, and further, I don't think the Israelis will bow to world opinion, because in a time of catastrophe, the outcries of world opinion will not save them. Pretense and illusion bring very little security. History is a good teacher and the Israelis are clearly aware of what their neighbors have in store for them. What we see here, therefore, is literally a reincarnation of the struggle of David against Goliath.

With the Russians training terrorist groups like the P.L.O., and working closely with Qaddafi of Libya, there hardly seems to be an opportunity for peace in the region. Apparently our State Department, with administration approval, appears to be seeking stabilization of the region, and they believe the way to do this is to withhold aid from its only acknowledged ally. In the extreme, this might be true, if we were dealing with sane and humane countries. But, how do you convince the Russians and Colonel Qaddafi, the Iraqis, and the P.L.O. to be nice guys and to stop shooting and exporting terrorism? The Russians say to its allies, "See, I support you no matter what" and the United States says to its only ally in the region, "If you don't behave yourself, we will withhold your armaments. You must learn to turn the other cheek." This hardly makes sense and who can benefit from such a policy? The Russians? The Saudis? The P.L.O.? But certainly not the Israelis.

I feel the greatest evil we have is that of ignorance and blindness. There is war in the region. Countries are seeking to destroy each other. I cannot see a solution because there is simply no means to accommodate peace by anyone.

I have no illusions about the Israelis. I think that they are truly standing alone. Should they suffer a serious attack, nothing will be done to help them. The only hope for the future is that somehow, some measure of reason may yet be born.

COMMODITY STEEL & PROCESSING, INC.

It has been written that desperate people do desperate things. The Israelis are at war, because a number of Arab countries are at war with them.

There are many examples that can be drawn from western civilization, as well as the eastern block, but in the final sense, it isn't "Do as I do", but "Do as I say". I maintain that if these people are to survive, they must recognize the cold hard facts that they are surrounded, that their enemies are shooting at them, and that they must be allowed to shoot back - or have we established new rules for warfare?

Very truly yours,

Louis H. Golden

LHG/amb

Enclosures: "Israel Collects Overdue Bill"
"Over to You, Cap"

THE DETROIT NEWS - Tuesday, June 30, 1981

Israel Collects Overdue Bill

By John Roche

Before the discussion of Israel's attack on the Iraqi nuclear reactor becomes overlaid with 10 layers of irrelevant rhetoric, let us emphasize square one: Iraq has been at war with Israel since 1948.

Indeed, the Iraqis, safely buffered behind Syria and Jordan, have been among the most ferocious anti-Israelis, the quintessential tigers. For more than 30 years they have been bellowing:

Roche

"Get in there and kill them!"

Now Israel has made the quite logical decision that if Iraq is at war with her, she is at war with Iraq.

ACTUALLY, Israel has been very patient with Iraq: One of the first rules of life is that you have to pay for an education. Israel has waited more than 30 years to send a bill to Baghdad. Throughout this period the Iraqis have had the option of making peace. Recently they could have joined Egypt in the Camp David Accords. Instead they and the Libyans, plus the Soviet stooges in South Yemen, have been the ultrarejectionists.

Naturally, all Iraq's Arab "brothers" had to make indignant noises, but in private there must have been a good deal of rejoicing. Iraq's attack on Iran, for example, did not exactly cheer the Saudis and terrified the Kuwaitis. Iraq has some sort of claim on Kuwait and only British intervention in 1961 rescued her from Baghdad's clutches.

Then there is Egypt's President Anwar Sadat, who cried all the way to the mosque when he heard the news. Sadat has been the main enemy of the rejectionists — they have called for his overthrow and murder — and it is alleged that on two occasions the Egyptian security forces were alerted by Israeli intelligence, Mossad, to impending assassination attempts. Sadat is busy helping Iran against Iraq in the forgotten war, and is probably trying to put out a contract on Iraq's pal, Libya's Col. Moammarf Khadafy, who has also called for his destruction.

In short, everywhere you look, you see Arab unity against the "savage" Israelis: Even Jordan and Syria are supporting opposite sides in the Gulf war. Moreover, this comes at a time when the "oil weapon" has lost its effectiveness: There is an unprecedented glut.

And the Soviet Union, which obviously provided Iraq with superb air defenses and MiG interceptors, is preoccupied with the impending possibility of a Warsaw-less pact.

So it's off to the United Nations Security Council where Israel is to be accused of "international piracy" and other random felonies. Recalling the state of war between Iraq and Israel, this is comparable to the Nazis accusing us of unwarranted aggression in invading Normandy. True, Israel has not previously socked Iraq, but that cannot be construed as a precedent. The allegedly illegal overflights of Saudi Arabia and possibly Jordan fall into the same category: Both states are technically at war with Israel.

Why then did the government of the United States have a fit over the Israelis taking out a perfectly legitimate military target in wartime? It was not a carpet bombing of Baghdad, comparable to our World War II raids on Hamburg or Tokyo, with baleful civilian casualties, but a surgical strike. But, the argument goes, our F-15s and 16s used in the attack are provided with the stipulation they be employed only for "defensive" purposes.

Fine. Ask yourself this question: In wartime, is it a legitimate "defensive" act to eliminate an enemy's potential weapons system?

As Israeli spokesmen have pointed out, had they waited until the reactor was "hot," the fallout from a demolition could have killed the population of Baghdad. Surely it was better to dispose of it before that appalling choice had to be faced.

There is a perfect parallel once we get it through our thick skulls that a state of war exists between Iraq and Israel: In World War II we were afraid the Nazis might be developing an atomic bomb. One possible route toward nuclear fission required large amounts of "heavy water," and the main German plant creating this stuff was in Norway. Twice we launched commando raids to eliminate that facility.

SIMILARLY when we got wind of the revolutionary Fokker Wolf jet fighters the *Luftwaffe* almost got in time, we launched several suicide raids on the factories that made the key components — the subject of a fine Clark Gable movie *Command Decision*. In other words, you don't have to wait until the enemy has his weapon operational before you try to destroy it.

Now as the howls go up at Foggy Bottom and Turtle Bay, just repeat to yourself every half hour:

"Iraq is at war with Israel."

That is the long and the short of the whole matter. War, after all, is played for keeps and Iraq had announced its nuclear bombs were reserved for "the Zionist entity."

WALL STREET JOURNAL - Tuesday, July 28, 1981

Over to You, Cap

Israeli Prime Minister Begin has agreed to a ceasefire, reluctantly and against the advice of his military leaders, to placate the U.S. administration, and principally its military chieftain, Defense Secretary Weinberger. We hope Mr. Weinberger and other leaders of the U.S. foreign policy establishment have some good plans afoot, because they have assumed a considerable responsibility for Israel's security and the peace of the Middle East. While presumably they are free now to ship Israel those much-delayed F-16s, the problem goes a great deal deeper than that.

An argument can be made, of course, that a ceasefire is better than no ceasefire. The killing and destruction stop (or at least it will if one holdout faction of the PLO decides to stop lobbing high explosives at Israel and its ally, the Lebanese Christian militia). It can even be argued that now that the PLO's Yasir Arafat has achieved at least the de facto diplomatic recognition he so badly wanted, he might become more statesmanlike towards actually negotiating a peace with Israel.

But although no administration can be blamed for striving for Mideast peace, it is not necessarily wise for a U.S. administration to be certain that its ideas for achieving peace are better than the ideas of the Israelis themselves. The fundamental Israeli approach is to make Arab assaults costly and futile by repelling them with superior force. It is indeed likely that the PLO would not have agreed to the latest truce if it had not been suffering heavy punishment at the hands of Israeli fighter-bombers. While the Israeli approach may have limitations over the long term, it has short-term success.

The U.S. has a deep interest in keeping its diplomatic ties with Saudi Arabia, and the Saudis maintain a commitment to the PLO cause. But there are fine calculations to be made in this kind of diplomacy. And it is doubtful that the public denunciations by the administration of the Israeli attacks on an Iraqi atom bomb plant and PLO headquarters buildings in Beirut contributed much toward maintaining a proper balance. Secretary Haig, to his credit, seems to have understood this better than Secretary Weinberger.

From all appearances the ceasefire works mainly to the benefit of the PLO. Mr. Arafat forced the U.S. and Israel to do business with him, however indirectly. He got the Israeli fighter-bombers off his back. He seemingly gave up very little. Indeed, while the Israelis say they understood from the U.S. that the truce would be off if the PLO tries to resupply its forces, the PLO claims no knowledge of any such understanding. The U.S. says the truce doesn't bar resupply.

So aside from the longer-term future of Mideast negotiations, the U.S. may soon be faced with the question of what it does if the PLO continues its military build-up, which involves heavy arms from Communist-bloc nations. It was something like this, Syria's insistence on putting ground-to-air missiles in the Bekaa Valley, that helped touch off the latest outbreak of hostilities and prompted the U.S. mediation effort.

We ourselves hope that the ceasefire not only holds but becomes a step toward a broader peace, but history is not encouraging. And if the ceasefire breaks down and leads to more fighting with the PLO armed more heavily, the U.S. might give the Israelis some credit for knowing what they were doing when they were overruled.

United States Department of State

Washington, D.C. 20520

July 17, 1981

Mr. Louis Golden
Commodity Steel & Processing, Inc.
8701 East Eight Mile Road
Warren, Michigan 48089

Dear Mr. Golden:

I am replying to your message to President Reagan concerning the June 7 Israeli air attack on the nuclear reactor under construction in Tuwaitha, Iraq.

On June 8, the Department Spokesman condemned the Israeli air strike, noting that the unprecedented character of this action would seriously add to the already tense situation in the area and complicate our efforts to peacefully resolve problems there. The United States was not consulted in any way about any phase of the operation and was not informed of it in advance.

On June 10, the President suspended the scheduled delivery of four F-16 aircraft to Israel pending further study of the Israeli action and consultations with Congress. That same day, pursuant to Section 3 of the Arms Export Control Act, Secretary Haig sent letters to the Chairmen of the Senate Foreign Relations and House Foreign Affairs Committees indicating that a substantial violation of the 1952 U.S.-Israel Mutual Defense Assistance Agreement may have occurred. That agreement includes Israel's assurance that weapons acquired from the United States will be used only to maintain its internal security, its legitimate self-defense, or to permit it to participate in regional or United Nations (U.N.) collective security arrangements and measures. It also provides that Israel will not undertake any act of aggression against any other state. Israel has confirmed that the Israeli Air Force units involved in the air strike were equipped with defense articles furnished by the United States under the Foreign Military Sales program.

On June 19, the United States voted for U.N. Security Council Resolution 487 condemning the Israeli attack, making clear our profound concern about the raid's impact on the peace and security of all the nations of the Middle East.

We are reviewing this entire matter and discussing it with the Government of Israel. Neither our condemnation nor the suspension of delivery of the four aircraft is meant to imply that we have reached any determination on the questions raised under U.S. law by Israel's act.

We have carefully noted the Israeli and Iraqi positions. Israel contends that its action against Iraq was a necessary, legitimate act of self-defense because the Iraqi reactor was intended to produce weapons grade material to make atomic bombs. Israel also points out that there is a state of war between the two countries and contends that Iraq had made clear its intention to produce such a weapon for use against Israel.

Iraq, on the other hand, denies that its nuclear program has any application other than the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. Iraq points out that it has ratified the Non-Proliferation Treaty and that its reactor and supply of enriched uranium were subject to International Atomic Energy Agency safeguard controls.

The United States does not believe that force can provide the answer to international disputes. Our condemnation of Israel's action was intended to clearly express this view. At the same time, as Ambassador Kirkpatrick made clear before the U.N. Security Council, we remain fully committed to the security and well-being of Israel and to the friendship between our two countries. The United States will continue to do all in its power to achieve a just and lasting peace for all the peoples of the Middle East.

Sincerely,

Dean E Fischer

Dean E. Fischer
Assistant Secretary-Designate
for Public Affairs
and Department Spokesman